TR

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,254	07/29/2003	Peter Robert Neuwald	P23662	5431

7055 7590 04/20/2007

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER	
BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2155	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/20/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 04/20/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com
pto@gbpatent.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/628,254	NEUWALD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Benjamin R. Bruckart	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 July 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *20030925*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Claims 1-25 are pending in this Office Action.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed on 9/25/03 has been considered.

Specification

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

(a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
(b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
(c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
(d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
(e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
(f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
    (1) Field of the Invention.
    (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
(g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
(h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
(i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
(j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
(k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
(l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Applicant is missing a Brief Summary of the Invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 9 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication 20040039800 by Black et al.

Regarding claim 1, a method of managing connections between a Java 2 enterprise edition (J2EE) application server and a common object request broker architecture (CORBA) enterprise information system (Black: pages 5-6, para 60-63; Fig. 5B), comprising:

integrating a resource adapter with the application server, the resource adapter comprising an encapsulated CORBA interface to the enterprise information system (Black: pages 5-6, para 60-63; Fig. 5A-5B); and

establishing a persistent CORBA connection between the application server and the enterprise information system (Black: page 6, para 62; Fig 5A-D).

Claims 9 and 17 are rejected under the same rationale given above as being substantially similar to claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication 20040039800 by Black et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,980,515 by Schunk et al.

Regarding claim 2, the Black reference teaches the method of managing connections according to claim 1.

The Black reference fails to teach determining availability.

However, the Schunk reference teaches, further comprising receiving a request from an application component implemented by the application server to allocate the persistent connection and determining whether the persistent connection is available for allocation (Schunk: col. 4, lines 24-30) in order to maintain a high level of performance and availability while minimizing delays and bottlenecks (Schunk: col. 1, lines 30-36).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of managing connections as taught by Black to include determining availability as taught by Schunk in order to maintain a high level of performance and availability while minimizing delays and bottlenecks (Schunk: col. 1, lines 30-36).

Regarding claim 3, the Black reference teaches the method of managing connections according to claim 2.

The Black reference fails to teach determining availability.

However, the Schunk reference teaches, further comprising allocating the persistent CORBA connection to the application component when a persistent CORBA connection is available, and informing the application component that the CORBA connection is unavailable when the persistent CORBA connection is unavailable (Schunk: col. 8, lines 65- col. 9, line 2; col. 16, lines 56-65) in order to maintain a high level of performance and availability while minimizing delays and bottlenecks (Schunk: col. 1, lines 30-36).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of managing connections as taught by Black to include determining

availability as taught by Schunk in order to maintain a high level of performance and availability while minimizing delays and bottlenecks (Schunk: col. 1, lines 30-36).

Regarding claim 4, the Black reference teaches the method of managing connections according to claim 2.

The Black reference fails to teach determining availability.

However, the Schunk reference teaches, further comprising establishing another persistent CORBA connection between the application server and the enterprise information system when the persistent CORBA connection is unavailable, and allocating the other persistent CORBA connection to the application component (Schunk: col. 16, lines 11-35) in order to maintain a high level of performance and availability while minimizing delays and bottlenecks (Schunk: col. 1, lines 30-36).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of managing connections as taught by Black to include determining availability as taught by Schunk in order to maintain a high level of performance and availability while minimizing delays and bottlenecks (Schunk: col. 1, lines 30-36).

Regarding claim 5, the Black reference teaches the method of managing connections according to claim 1.

The Black reference fails to teach determining availability.

However, the Schunk reference teaches, further comprising receiving a message from the enterprise information system indicating that the persistent CORBA connection is not active and, in response, terminating the persistent CORBA connection (Schunk: col. 16, lines 22-35) in order to maintain a high level of performance and availability while minimizing delays and bottlenecks (Schunk: col. 1, lines 30-36).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of managing connections as taught by Black to include determining availability as taught by Schunk in order to maintain a high level of performance and availability while minimizing delays and bottlenecks (Schunk: col. 1, lines 30-36).

Regarding claim 6, the Black reference teaches the method of managing connections according to claim 1.

The Black reference fails to teach determining availability.

However, the Schunk reference teaches, further comprising monitoring the persistent CORBA connection to determine whether the persistent CORBA connection is active (Schunk: col. 24, lines 14-15; col. 6, lines 54-59) in order to maintain a high level of performance and availability while minimizing delays and bottlenecks (Schunk: col. 1, lines 30-36).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of managing connections as taught by Black to include determining availability as taught by Schunk in order to maintain a high level of performance and availability while minimizing delays and bottlenecks (Schunk: col. 1, lines 30-36).

Regarding claim 7, the Black reference teaches the method of managing connections according to claim 1.

The Black reference fails to teach determining availability.

However, the Schunk reference teaches, further comprising establishing additional CORBA connections between the application server and the enterprise information system until a predetermined minimum number of CORBA connections are established (Schunk: col. 16, lines 11-35; users 1 and 2) in order to maintain a high level of performance and availability while minimizing delays and bottlenecks (Schunk: col. 1, lines 30-36).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of managing connections as taught by Black to include determining availability as taught by Schunk in order to maintain a high level of performance and availability while minimizing delays and bottlenecks (Schunk: col. 1, lines 30-36).

Regarding claim 8, the Black reference teaches the method of managing connections according to claim 7.

The Black reference fails to teach determining availability.

However, the Schunk reference teaches, further comprising establishing additional CORBA connections between the application server and the enterprise information system until a

predetermined maximum number of CORBA connections are established (Schunk: col. 15, lines 64- col. 17, line 24),

wherein a CORBA connection established after the predetermined minimum number of CORBA connections are established, is established based on a determination, in response to a request from an application component implemented by the application server to allocate a CORBA connection, that the previously established CORBA connections are unavailable (Schunk: col. 16, lines 11-35) in order to maintain a high level of performance and availability while minimizing delays and bottlenecks (Schunk: col. 1, lines 30-36).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of managing connections as taught by Black to include determining availability as taught by Schunk in order to maintain a high level of performance and availability while minimizing delays and bottlenecks (Schunk: col. 1, lines 30-36).

Claims 10-16 and 18-25 are rejected under the same rationale given above as being substantially similar to claims 1-8.

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U. S. Patent No. 20020046240 by Graham et al teaches a CORBA resource pool of connections on page 4, para 52.

U. S. Patent No. 20030084056 by DeAnna et al teaches ZeoSphere servers for message forwarding and proxy of messages with CORBA ORB and EJB on page 4, para 36.

U. S. Patent No. 6,519,643 by Foulkes et al teaches Session Allocation Manager for multiple resource connections in Fig. 6, col. 14, lines 55- col. 15, line 13.

U. S. Patent No. 6,484,214 by Sundermier teaches a mediator component for brokering communications and connections between CORBA and Java in columns 3 and 4 and col 7, line 52- col. 8, line 20.

Remarks

The claims are drawn to a connector for bridging CORBA and J2EE platforms in a network while claiming rudimentary and fundamental elements of resource management in the dependent claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number 571-272-3982.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and after final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the examiner whose telephone number is 571-272-3982.

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER